

INTERN - LISA

198 12 -

FLOOR.

N? 6



[1896] Cons.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Ontario Council of University Libraries

INFORMATION

FOR THE

ELECTORS

No. 6.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

THE GRIT TRADE POLICY	2	THE LIBERAL LEADER :—A Criticism ..	11
▲ Revenue Tariff Policy	2	His Record as Administrator	11
▲ Policy of Modified Protection ..	3	As to His Patriotism	11
Commercial Union With United States	4	As to His Quebec Associations	12
Continental Free Trade	5	Mr. Laurier and His Present Associates	12
Unrestricted Reciprocity with U.S. ..	5	Mr. Lauriers' Present Policies and Principles	14
Free Trade as it is in England	6	Mr. Laurier's Shifts :—	13
Fad Hunters	8	A Protectionist	13
Anti-British Policy	8	A Commercial Unionist	13
They Make Another Charge	9	A Continental Free Trader	13
The Present Policy Analyzed	9	A Disciple of Unrestricted Reciprocity	13
Death to Protection	9	" Restricted Reciprocity ..	13
Tariff for Revenue only	10	A Free Trader as it is in England ..	13
Free Trade as Practised in England	10	Mr. Laurier and the Manitoba Schools	10

To secure copies of this pamphlet or any of the series, address

ROBERT BIRMINGHAM,

Secretary Liberal-Conservative Union,

9 KING ST. WEST, TORONTO, ONT.

THE GRIT TRADE POLICY.

Now that the electors are being asked to vote in favor of Mr. Laurier and his party, it is of the utmost importance that careful enquiry be made as to the policy to which, if he were placed in power, he would give effect.

No part of the policy of any party is more important than that which refers to the Trade and Commerce and business interests of the people. In the last analysis the progress and prosperity of the country depends upon the course taken in respect to these immense interests.

What then is Mr. Laurier's trade policy, and is it the better one for Canada?

This question may be answered by a glance at the past history of the Grit party. We will find that they have had many Trade policies. Let us number them.

(1) A Revenue Tariff Policy.

From 1873-4 to 1878-9 they carried out a Revenue Tariff Policy. Towards the close of their term of power the depression and distress which became general and marked forced into prominence the question as to whether or not the farmers and manufacturers of Canada should not be given some adequate protection against the keen competition and slaughter prices of the United States.

Men like Mr. Laurier, Mr. Charlton, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Workman and others in the party declared in favor of protection, and pleaded for it.

As proof of this assertion, let us read what was said by leading Liberals during that period:

Mr. Laurier, in 1871, declared: "It is humiliating to have to admit that after the existence of three hundred years, this country is not able to supply its own wants. Although Nature has been marvellously prodigal in her gifts and has done so much to make this a manufacturing country, we are yet dependent on foreign countries. It is our duty to foster our national industries." And in 1876: "It is asserted by many, and assumed by others, that Free Trade is a Liberal principle and Protection a Conservative principle. If I were in Great Britain I would be a Free Trader, but I am a Canadian born and a resident here, and I think that we require protection. We have within ourselves the ability to create an industry. If it is shown that we cannot maintain it, unless by legislation either in the way of premium or prohibitory tariff,

then I should be ready to take that into consideration."

Mr. Blake, M. P., in 1875, said:—"We should, as far as we legitimately can, distribute the taxes so as to give a benefit to our home industry. If not absolutely essential to the greatness of a people, variety of industry is certainly a great help to its growth."

Mr. Charlton, M. P., in 1876, said:—"I believe the agricultural interests would be benefitted by protection. I would make a market by bringing the manufacturer to the door of the farmer. The home market is of greatest value."

Mr. Jones, M. P., in 1876, said:—"There must be a readjustment of the duties on sugar so as to encourage our refineries. At present they are closed and some thousands of people are thrown out of employment. The duties on raw material are too high and on the refined article too low."

Mr. Joly, M. P., in 1877, declared:—"The admission of grain free of duty is against the interests of the farmers of Canada. I am decidedly in favor of protection of the home markets of this country."

Mr. Patterson, M. P., in 1876, "held that the Administration should protect our agricultural interests. Such a duty would not bear in any way upon the consumers and would be of great advantage to the interests concerned. The small duty upon grain would benefit the farmers of this country. It is well known that we pay a bonus to the inhabitants of other countries to come into Canada and settle in our midst. I believe by a defensive tariff that you would not have to pay to bring those men here. Adopt it, and you will find that the steam whistles of our factories will be the call for them to come. The other year, the Finance Minister, in revising our tariff, gave some encouragement to one industry which it never had before. The result was that one thousand men who were engaged in that industry in Germany were literally transported, by the change in the tariff, to Canada and set to work here. The cost of the article was not increased one iota and Canada got all the benefit."

Mr. Blain, M. P., in 1876, said:—"I feel that I should like the Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) to come down with a tariff policy that would enable us to protect our home industries and that would enable us to bring our producers and consumers together."

Mr. Young, M. P., in 1876—"If we are

to have the tariff altered, and if my honorable friend can frame the measure that some relief can be given to the manufacturers from the unfair competition of the United States, the Finance Minister would earn the approval of the House and of the country."

Mr. Workman, M.P., in 1876—"We feel the unjustness of admitting provisions into our country from the United States free, while a duty of 20 per cent. is placed on flour and grain sent to the United States. I am sure that the Government of the day will not ignore, and I do not think they can ignore, the cry for protection that has gone forth through this country, commencing at Quebec and coming to Montreal, Toronto, London, Hamilton, and all through Canada. Every candidate who will dare to announce himself as opposed to protection will be elected to stay at home."

Mr. Devlin, M. P., in 1876—"I feel it my duty to say that I am in complete harmony with a policy of protection for our manufacturing industries. I am perfectly willing to assist in the passage of any law that will reverse the policy of the present Government, though it gives me great regret. When the United States people close their market we should retaliate by closing our markets against them."

But Mr. Mackenzie and Sir Richard Cartwright were obstinately opposed to meeting this view; they proved superior in following, they dragoned the Protectionist Liberals into order, and kept their party on the old lines.

On these lines they went to the country in 1878, and were completely defeated. Their Policy of Revenue Tariff was discarded and the policy of a reasonable protection affirmed.

The Grits went into opposition. They changed their leader, and under Mr. Blake, they criticised and fought the National Policy from 1878 to 1882 and in the latter year appealed to the people still on the Revenue Tariff Policy as opposed to protection. They were again defeated, and the National Policy was again affirmed.

(2) A Policy of Modified Protection.

From 1882 to 1887 they fought the National Policy and stood on the old platform, until just on the eve of the elections Mr. Blake made the famous Malvern Speech in which he virtually recanted the errors of his party; declared in favor of a slightly modified Protective Tariff, affirmed that Free Trade was impossible, and bound his party in general and Sir Richard Cartwright in particular to

an agreement in favor of continuing adequate protection to the industries of Canada if he should be returned to power. That there may be no doubt on this point let us read what he said at Malvern, Jan. 22nd, 1887 :—

"I invite the most ardent free-trader in public life to present a plausible solution of this problem; and I contend that he is bound to do so before he talks of free trade as practicable in Canada. I have not believed it soluble in my day; and any chance of its solubility, if chance there were, has been destroyed by the vast increase of our yearly charge and by the other conditions which have been created. The thing is removed from the domain of practical politics."

Having laid down the principle that "Free Trade is removed from the domain of practical politics," he proceeded to inform the manufacturers that they had nothing to fear from any radical change in policy, and to pledge his party on these lines. He declared :

"What I have said, and am about to say, on all questions of principle, you may then take as authoritative, to whatever extent a leader has authority, and so far from there being divergence, I can assure you that there is, in my belief, a general concurrence of sentiment between us, including Sir Richard Cartwright, whom I name only because our adversaries delight to represent him as holding other views."

The people of Canada, however, distrusted the long declared opponents of protection, put no faith in this sudden conversion on the eve of the election, and preferred to place in power the old friends and supporters of the National Policy.

The Grit party was utterly routed at the polls in 1887, and the Liberal-Conservatives returned for a third term. Then commenced the years of policy panic.

But a few months had passed after the elections of 1887 and the declaration of the leader of the party, Mr. Edward Blake, above quoted, before Sir Richard Cartwright took occasion to repudiate him and his trade policy. Mr. Blake retired from the leadership and was replaced by Mr. Laurier, under whose weak guidance began and has continued those fitful and foolish changes which have brought the Grit party into its present sad plight as regards Trade Policy.

About this time Mr. Erastus Wiman appeared upon the scene fresh from New York and began that strange tutelage and quasi leadership of the Liberal party towards commercial union and ultimate

political union with the United States. The Toronto *Globe* and the readers of the Grit party eagerly took up his views, and a campaign was entered upon at once for the adoption of the third trade policy of the Liberal party, viz :—

(3) Commercial Union with the United States.

In March 1888, Sir Richard Cartwright introduced the following resolution in the House of Commons :

"That it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or internal revenue alone excepted)."

How this was regarded in the country by the rank and file of the Grit party may be seen by the following extract from the *Halifax Morning Chronicle* :

"The despatch from Ottawa giving an account of the determination of the first Liberal caucus at Ottawa is the most important piece of political intelligence which has reached this country for some time. It is the most important movement made upon the political chess board since Confederation, and is likely to revolutionize political controversy in this country. This is the first time that Commercial Union has been adopted by either of the great political parties. Henceforward it becomes the burning question of the day."

That Commercial Union was adopted by the party and what it meant are easily seen from statements made by its advocates :

Mr. Laurier said : "The policy which we advocate, which we still continue to advocate, is the removal of all commercial barriers between this country and the great kindred nation to the south. The Liberal party, as long as I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause until the cause is successful. I do not expect to win in a day, but I am prepared to remain in the cool shades of opposition until this cause has triumphed."

Sir Richard Cartwright declared—"I say that the greatest service we can render to the British Empire is to form an alliance with the people of the United States."

Mr. Wiman defined Commercial Union in this way :—"That as against all the rest of the world the same rates of duty should be collected by Canada as are now levied by the United States, while between those two countries of North America the customs line should be completely obliterated, in other words, the proposition is that around the whole continent of North

America one customs line should exist and have precisely a uniform height."

Mr. Charlton said : "The application of the principle between Canada and the United States would require that the two countries should have the same excise rates and the same tariff upon imports from all other countries ; that the revenue thus collected in both countries should be divided upon conditions hereafter to be arranged ; that the customs line between the two countries from ocean to ocean should be removed, and that trade between Canada and the States should be in every respect as free and untrammelled as trade between the different States of the American Union was at the present moment."

Mr. Davies, M.P., said : "Under Commercial Union trade would flow freely between this country and the United States, as it now flows between the several States ; while, as against the rest of the world there would be a uniform tariff to be mutually agreed upon by the two countries comprised in the union."

This policy then was one which would have removed all duties on imports between the United States and Canada, done away with the line of Customs Houses between the two countries, and erected a tariff for the United States and Canada against the rest of the world either uniform in both countries or different in each. If uniform in both, the United States would virtually have made the Canadian tariff, and we should have been deprived of our commercial autonomy ; if a different tariff in each country and no customs line along the border there would have been opportunity for the unlimited introduction of foreign goods into each country through the other, and the plan would have been utterly unworkable. In either case it would have deprived Canada of more than one half of her Customs Revenue and rendered a resort to direct taxation absolutely necessary. It would also have meant the complete commercial conquest of Canada by the United States. Every prominent politician in the United States looked upon this scheme and advocated it as the first step to the political absorption of Canada into the United States.

Yet the Liberal leaders eagerly took it up—advocated it, and only abandoned it when the repeated protests of the Canadian people warned them of its unpopularity.

Along with and following directly upon the Grit advocacy of Commercial Union with the United States another policy was propounded by the leader, Mr. Laurier, viz :—

(4) Continental Free Trade.

Here is Mr. Laurier's declaration on this point made in 1889:—

"The Liberal party will never cease the agitation until they have finally triumphed and obtained continental freedom of trade. We will not be drawn away by this issue or that issue, and keeping our eyes upon the goal, will work till we accomplish our end. If the reformers of these days can accomplish what they have in view—the great principle of free trade in America—they will have done to their country and to the British race a service of which they will have reason to be proud."

Sir Richard Cartwright, at Oakville, declared—I desire to see Free Trade all over this continent.

Mr. Charlton, M. P., declared in an address to the Young Men's Liberal Club in Toronto:—"We want unrestricted and free access to the whole of North America with our produce and a great increase of wealth would follow; we wanted to pull down all customs barriers, to enjoy absolute Free Trade, to establish a mighty theatre of commerce extending over a vast continent—from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic Ocean."

This was a wider flight, was purely the idle vapouring of a theorist and gained little headway in either the party or the country. It was, therefore, soon thrown aside.

The next definitely adopted policy of the Grit party was:

(5) Unrestricted Reciprocity with the United States.

This policy was initiated in 1889, when in the House of Commons, on March 5th, Sir Richard Cartwright moved the following resolution:

"That in the present condition of affairs, and in view of the recent action of the House of Representatives of the United States, it is expedient that steps should be taken to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith."

This was the policy which dominated the party from 1889, and became the plank on which was fought the elections of 1891, and the bye-elections thereafter.

Here are some of the many declarations of the leaders of the party on this head:

Mr. Laurier in 1891, said—"When the Liberal party comes into power it will send commissioners to Washington to propose a mutual agreement by which there will be free trade along the whole line,

doing away with restrictions and removing the Custom Houses that go so far to cause friction between the two countries."

In the House of Commons Mr. Davies said—"Sir, we tender the people a flag of which we are not ashamed, a flag upon which is inscribed 'unrestricted trade with the United States.'"

Sir Richard Cartwright at Chatham, 1891—"But what is of even more immediate consequence, we propose to obtain for you the power to trade freely with the rest of this continent; to have leave to make the best use you can of your great natural advantages which can only be done by full, free, and unrestricted reciprocity with our kinsmen in the United States."

And again he said at Chatham, 1891—"But let us always bear in mind that the geographical position of the bulk of Canada is such that at the very best, all and every other foreign market is but a makeshift, and can in no way ever really replace for you the market of the United States."

At Oakwood, *Globe*, Nov. 6, 1891, he said—"The fact is plain and clear and simple, the best market for the articles you produce, not by the decree of man, but by the decree of the Almighty, lies in the country which extends to the south of you, separated generally by a mere imaginary line along the 3,000 miles of our southern frontier, reaching from that line almost to the equator. There is your market, there is the one market you can hope to hold, there is the market you have the natural advantages to enable you to compete for."

"I deliberately tell you that the market of the United States is absolutely and exactly worth all the rest of the world to us, situated as we now are."

Sir Richard Cartwright at Oakville, in 1888, said—"It will enrich you (not only) by giving you better prices for your horses and your barley."

And at Meaford, in 1890—"I am speaking within the mark when I tell you that, were the barriers removed, you might look to seeing our trade with our neighbors amounting to three or four hundreds of millions in place of the eighty millions which we now altogether export and import."

This policy was defeated in 1891 and repudiated most effectually in the bye-elections immediately succeeding.

It would have involved:

1. The free introduction of the products of United States farms, forests, fisheries, mines and manufactories into Canada in

direct and ruinous competition with our own products.

2. The adoption of a high uniform tariff for the United States and Canada as against the rest of the world. This would have involved a direct discrimination against the products of Great Britain.

3. The loss of fully three quarters of our customs duty on imports which would have left us with a deficiency of about \$16,000,000, to be made up by direct taxation.

4. It would have inevitably led to the severance of Canada from the mother country, and made her at first dependent upon and then a part of the United States. If any doubt exists as to the fact that this plan of unrestricted reciprocity involved discrimination against Great Britain, let it be set at rest by the following declarations of the leaders:—

Mr. Laurier, not Sir Richard, before the elections in 1891, always denied discrimination; each country was to have its own tariff. He said: "We never once wished to discriminate against Great Britain."

Yet at Boston after the elections in 1891, he says:—

"The proposition which we make involves the position that we would offer to the American people that which is denied to the rest of the world. In so saying I do not forget that I am a subject of the British crown."

Mr. Edgar, M. P., said: "It is hopeless to expect Reciprocity with the United States, which will not involve discrimination against Great Britain."

Sir Richard Cartwright declared:

"If it does discriminate against Great Britain we have a right to. We owe Great Britain nothing but charity for her atrocious blundering against our interests. There never was a time that Canada could not have bettered her position by joining the United States."

The *Globe*, February 4th, 1891, declared—"If Free Trade with the United States will be good for us, let us vote for it though it should involve discrimination against Great Britain twice over."

Discouraged and dispirited by the failure of Unrestricted Reciprocity to draw the support of the country, the party called a convention in 1893 and laid down a platform, the trade portion of which may be designated as including:

1. The elimination of every vestige of protection from the tariff.

2. The adoption of a tariff for revenue only on the model of Free Trade as it is in England.

3. Reciprocity with the United States,

Thereupon was put forth the trade policy upon which the present contest is to be fought, viz.:

(6) Free Trade as it is Practiced in England, etc., etc.

Since 1893 this has been exposed and explained to the country from Cape Breton to Victoria by the leader of the party, Mr. Laurier, and by Sir Richard Cartwright and others.

It is instructive to examine their utterances and thus obtain an idea of what it is really proposed to substitute in place of the National Policy.

Laurier, Brantford, August 20, 1894—"I propose that we should follow England's example and open our ports to the products of the world."

Mr. Laurier at Winnipeg, Sept. 4th, 1894—"The task of the Liberals of the province of Manitoba, the task of the Liberals of this province in particular, has been to prove to the world and to our countrymen the benefits which are to be derived from the principles of free trade. I came before you to-night to preach to you this new gospel of freedom of trade. I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage, yes bondage, and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which the American slavery was bondage."

Mr. Laurier at Montreal—"Upon that question, I need not tell you that we stand at the very antipodes of the Conservative party. The Conservative party believe in protection: All their hope is in protection. The Liberal party believe in Free Trade on broad lines such as exist in Great Britain, and their immediate object is a revenue tariff—a tariff to be derived from Customs, but which will levy no duties, except for the purposes of revenue."

Mr. Laurier at Quebec, *Globe*, January 20, 1894—"Gentlemen, the only way in which Quebec can recover its old time prosperity as a maritime city is by adopting the policy of freedom of trade as it exists in the mother country, Old England."

"I have told you that our object is to have a customs tariff for revenue only."

"Upon the question of protection there can be no compromise."

"We stand here against protection, and in favor of a customs tariff based upon the principles of revenue and nothing else."

"The system of protection has been the bane and curse of Canada."

"The Liberal party believe in Free Trade on the broad lines such as exist in Great Britain."

"Now, sir, I may be told, do you pretend that if we were to abolish the system of protection that our manufacturers can live in the city of Montreal. Why, sir, I certainly pretend it."

"I say that not a cent should be collected beyond what is required to meet the country's necessities. We will tax for revenue, but not one cent for protection. When we are in power we will relieve the people of protection which is a fraud, a delusion and a robbery."

Mr. Laurier at Brampton in 1894, said—"If we come to power on that day I promise you a commission will go to Washington and if we can get a treaty in natural products and a list of manufactured articles that Treaty will be made."

The policy of the Liberal party is to give you a market with the 65 million British men upon this continent."

Mr. Laurier at Brantford in Aug., 1894—"Is there any man to say that he would not be content to open the Canadian market to the American manufacturers if in return he obtained access to the American market for his products."

Sir Richard Cartwright declared—"Our policy from first to last has been to destroy this villainous protective system by Free Trade, Revenue Tariff, or Continental Free Trade."

And again—"Sir, they demand our policy. Well, sir, they shall have our policy, and here I believe I speak for my hon. friends beside me. Our policy is death to protection and war to the knife to corruption. Sir, we strike and we will strike for liberty and freedom from this system of protective taxation, and I tell the honourable gentlemen that we will not rest until the slavery that they have imposed upon us has become a thing of the past, and until Canadians are as free as Canadians ought to, be free to make the most they can of the opportunities God has given them."

And again—"There is no Canadian manufacturer who need be afraid to face the competition of the world. Our policy is death to protection."

Sir Richard proposes to make the change thorough for he says referring to some who advocate no drastic revision,—"There are two lessons which I think the Reformers of Canada should learn. One is presented for our example and warning in the fate that has befallen the Democratic party in the United States. It shows to all who choose to read the signs of the times that when a party places itself at the head of a great popular movement, if that party tenders

the people a stone instead of bread, it is half-hearted in the prosecution of the great aim it sets before it, and will be deservedly swept out of power by the very people who would have sustained and advanced it."

To show Sir Richard's views on protection, we quote. At Pembroke, 1890, he said: "I say our protective system was a huge mistake in so far as it was honest at all and in so far as it was not honest, it was a huge scheme of robbery."

"A small ring and clique of combiners and protected manufacturers, who as I have told you, have been permitted for years past to make a prey and plunder of the people of Canada."

At Meaford, 1890, he said,—"I stand by the declaration I have made that protection is nothing more nor less than deliberate legalized and organized robbery, and, more than that, if you do not stamp it out it is the very high road to political slavery first and industrial slavery afterward."

And at Chatham, in 1891,—"That this is very largely due to a most vicious system of legislation under which the whole fiscal system of Canada has become an instrument of legalized robbery on a scale and to an extent absolutely unprecedented in the history of any other country so young as our own."

"We pay 31 or 32 million dollars of taxes every year into the treasury, and we are really taxed to the tune of 50 or 60 millions a year, counting what we pay to the legalized robbers, whose hands are never out of your pockets at your down sitting or your uprising—whether you eat, or drink, or work, or play, or sleep, or fall sick even."

"The protective system of the new world is a different and much more dangerous thing than the protective system of the old world, and we all, farmers especially, are suffering accordingly."

"You have to deal with a gang of combines, highly paid and highly drilled mercenaries who have enslaved you, and who mean to keep you enslaved, if fraud and corruption can do it."

"And at Sarnia, March 2, 1895—"We must find you better markets, and we don't propose to look for them by preference at the antipodes. We do propose Free Trade with all the world as our ultimate goal but we will be very glad to secure for you Free Trade with the rest of this continent as an exceedingly comfortable instalment on the way thither."

Mr. Davies, in the House of Commons, speaking of protection, said,—"We have been attacking this policy

year by year. It is a cursed system, accursed of God and man."

Mr. Davies in Nova Scotia in 1894 declared—"Well, gentlemen, I need say no more. Whatever doubts or difficulties there may have been about understanding our trade policy in the times past, there can be none now. Our platform is clear and definite. To-day the people of Canada stand face to face with such an issue, and the next contest is to be one between Free Trade and Protection. . . . The policy of the Liberal party, on the contrary, is the reform of the tariff by the elimination from it of every vestige of protection." . . . We propose that either by treaty or by tariff legislation the duties upon articles exchanged between Canada and the United States should be reduced on both sides, or better still, made altogether free."

Here then we have laid down the Tariff Policies of the Grit party.

Nowhere in the history of political parties can there be found a record of such vacillation, weakness and absurdity, in a matter of such vast importance as the Trade basis of a country.

Fad Hunters.

The Grits have run after every fad that presented to their minds the remotest chance to catch votes; they have erected each one into an article of their political creed, and called upon their followers to bow down and worship it; they have as quickly withdrawn it upon defeat and substituted another in its place to be worshipped for a short time and then to be itself laid away to rest among the dead Gods. In doing this they have showed an utter ignorance of economic and trade principles and practice which is phenomenal, and have written themselves down as incapable of grasping the genius and aspirations and necessities of Canadian Trade development.

Anti-British Policy.

Each step they have taken involved consequences either to the material interests of Canada, or to the political and permanent interests of the Empire which caused thinking business men and loyal patriotic citizens to combat and antagonize them. Mr. Blake, one of their ablest men, and a leader whom for years they followed with faith and confidence was obliged to sever his connection with his party on account of their policy of Unrestricted Reciprocity which he declared came so near to treason that as a loyal subject of Britain he could not longer remain with them. Note this sentence in his farewell address to them:—

Here is Mr. Blake's language:

"The tendency of unrestricted Free Trade with the United States, high duties being maintained against the United Kingdom would be towards political union, and the more successful the plan, the stronger the tendency, both by reason of the community of interests, the intermingling of populations, the more intimate business and social connections, and the trade and fiscal relations, amounting to dependency, which it would create with the States, and of the greater isolation and divergency from Great Britain which it would produce; and also and especially through inconvenience experienced in the maintenance and apprehensions entertained as to the termination of the treaty—our hopes and our fears alike would draw one way. We would then indeed be looking to Washington . . . Assuming that absolute Free Trade, best described as commercial union, may and ought to come, I believe it can only come as an incident, or at any rate as a well understood precursor of political union, for which indeed we should be able to get better terms before than after the surrender of our commercial independence."

At last Sir Oliver Mowat took the matter in his own hands, gathered the loyal wing of his party together and forced in 1893 the tacit abandonment of that plank in this policy. Note his warning to the party when in a letter to Mr. McKay, M.P.P., Woodstock, in 1891, he said:—"The great majority of our people, I believe and trust, are not prepared to hand over this great Dominion to a foreign nation for any present commercial consideration which may be proposed."

"We recognize the advantages which would go to both them and us from extended trade relations, and we are willing to go as far in that direction as shall not involve, now or in the future, political union; but there Canadians of every party have hitherto drawn the line, and I trust will continue to draw the line."

Mr. Mowat, in 1891, in a letter to Alex. McKenzie, said:—"I desire to call to the notice of such that for the Liberal party or any important section of it to favor political union with the United States would be death to all hope of Liberal ascendancy in the councils of the Dominion."

"To promote disaffection towards our own nation is against all our aspirations for Canada's national future."

"But this denying sentiment is absurd. From sentiment men sacrifice their property and even their lives; and every example of such sacrifice goes home to the

hearts of all who see it or hear of it. It is sentiment which in a thousand ways rules the world."

Hon. David Mills called a halt in the mad course adopted by Mr. Laurier and Sir Richard Cartwright. Speaking at Ridgetown in 1893 he declared:—

"The people have failed in their duty but they have not so far departed from the path of rectitude as to put their honor in the market."

"We are not prepared, I hope, to abandon a hundred years of constitutional progress for the momentary advantages of freer commercial intercourse."

"But it seemed to me that some had thoughtlessly entered in other parts of the country upon dangerous ways, which if not abandoned must lead to disaster, and that I could not do a better service than at once to point out the road that our duty to the country requires us to take."

THEY MAKE A CHANGE

Driven by defeats at the polls, by revolt among the more loyal portion of their own party, and by fear of the patriotic sentiment of the country, the party has now made another change.

The incidental Protection of 1874-8, the modified Protection of 1887, Commercial Union with the United States, Continental Free Trade, Unrestricted Reciprocity with the United States, were successively laid aside—the last one with manly regret and with a tacit agreement that it was laid aside more in name than in fact.

In the place of these, they have now adopted a sixth trade policy—final as long as it lasts.

The Present Policy Analyzed.

This policy is a hybrid. Its component parts are:

- (a) *Death to Protection.*
- (b) *A Tariff for Revenue only.*
- (c) *Free Trade as practised in England.*
- (d) *Reciprocity with the United States.*

Let us examine this hybrid and dissect it in the light of the utterances quoted above. It is of the utmost importance that a clear idea should be had of its meaning and its practicability.

(a) DEATH TO PROTECTION.

(1.) The Grit policy means death to protection, "every vestige" of which must be eliminated.

Are Canadians ready for that?

Look back at the period from 1874-78. All our business interests were depressed. Industries were shut up, markets were demoralized, employment was not to be found, and the farmers, by a 100,000 petitions, were asking relief.

Contrast that with the aspect to-day. Compare that with the period of 1890-95, when in a world-wide depression Canada came through with less trouble than any country in the world.

Why was protection asked for in 1878?

Because of intense outside competition, largely from the United States and other highly protected countries.

Is this competition any the less keen to-day than then? No. It is more keen and merciless.

Are the protective tariffs of the United States and other countries less high than in 1874-8?

No. They are higher.

The United States has a tariff on an average of nearly 40 p. c., while ours is less than 30 p. c. on dutiable goods.

The French tariff is higher. The German tariff is higher. There is but one country in the world which allows our goods free entry—all others meet us with high or prohibitive tariffs. All these countries have since 1878 greatly developed their systems of manufactures. They are daily developing them and competing successfully in Britain and with Britain.

Is it wise for us, young, new in manufacturing, with disadvantages in capital and skill to open our markets to all these, and gain no access to any one of them? Is that fair to our capital, our artisans, our Sourcers?

If Protection is removed, it must be removed along the whole line.

What have the farmers to say to that?

They have now practical control of the home market. They supply now our total urban population of 1,500,000 with farm products, which gives them a home market, practically free from competition, of the value of \$90,000,000. Take off protection, and from the surplus wheat, corn, meats, and other foods of the United States, they would find these markets flooded. Would they be braved in such a competition?

What would they get in return? Nothing. The United States have and will retain a prohibitive tariff, or nearly so, in farm products.

Are the farmers willing to be kept from the U. S. markets and to give U. S. farmers free access to their markets?

And our Artisans what have they to say?

Let United States and all other manufacturers into Canada free or on a basis of revenue only, and our industries close down. There is no doubt of that. If they close down, whence will come the wage for the artisan?

If the wage is wanting what becomes of the artisan and his family?

With all her cheap capital, and centuries of skill and commanding position Great Britain finds to-day her goods undersold and her artisans thrown out of employment by foreign competition. What would result in Canada under free competition and no protection?

And with Farmers' home market invaded, with industries shut down, and artisans out of employment what would our merchants and business men do? What would our bankers do? *To take down our moderate protection, to open our markets to the highly protected industries of the world, and gain no footing of advantage in any single country: that is what the Grits propose, and that means business ruin!*

But you say, "*The Grits don't mean it.*" Don't they? Then you must have queer notions of their veracity. Then you must write them down as arrant liars and humbugs. Read over the utterances of their leaders—and make no mistake.

Either they mean what they say, and so should not be allowed to ruin Canada

or
They do not mean what they say, and are beneath the notice of honorable men and unfit to be trusted.

Whichever is the alternative honest electors, intelligent electors, should vote against them.

(b) TARIFF FOR REVENUE ONLY.

This is consistent with the first division of their platform, viz., the elimination of every vestige of protection.

How then will they levy their customs tariff?

Remember it is for revenue only, not one cent for protection, and Great Britain is the model.

How? They must raise revenue by taxing what we do not produce in Canada.

We do not grow tea in Canada; tea will be taxed. It is now free.

We do not grow coffee in Canada; coffee will be taxed. It is now free.

We do not grow cotton in Canada; cotton will be taxed. It is now free, and besides it is the raw material of one of our largest industries. But cotton is a raw material and Mr. Laurier says that raw materials are not to be taxed. So we will throw that off.

We do not grow raw cane sugar in Canada. That will be heavily taxed, and the refineries stopped and thousands thrown out of employment.

Now we have exhausted most of the important articles of which we consume largely, and which we do not grow in

Canada. Tax these as heavily as you can and the amount of revenue from customs will be but small; not more than four or five million dollars. An immense sum—sixteen to eighteen millions will still have to be raised in some way. How? By direct taxation, if they follow the English method. And Canada is not ready for direct taxation! But say they, we will put a revenue tax on cottons, woollens, hardware and manufactured articles. Yes, but it must be according to your declarations without giving one cent for protection.

Now put on say 25 per cent. on woollen goods. That 25 per cent. is that much protection to the woollen manufacturer, and according to the Grit doctrine, enables him to charge just that much more for his goods and to us they say put that much money in his own pocket instead of into the treasury.

The only way they can do to be consistent is to place an equal excise duty of 25 per cent. on the manufacture of woollens in Canada. This would offset the customs duty and allow "not one cent of protection" to the manufacturer. But what would happen then? This, that all woollens would be made exactly 25 per cent. dearer than if there were no tax at all. Instead of having free wool, and the work done here, we should have practically duty paid wool, proportional to the customs rate on woollens and consequently no protection. As a result the woollen industry would succumb to foreign competition. And so on for other things. Customs revenue alone without protection is impossible. Customs taxation with a counter-vailing excise tax is neither Free Trade nor protection, is not according to the English plan and is impossible in Canada.

The third part of the Tariff platform is:

(c) FREE TRADE AS IT IS PRACTISED IN ENGLAND.

How is it in England?

The customs revenue is raised on tea, coffee, dried fruits, tobacco and spirits.

All other goods come in free. That, of course, would mean the elimination of all protection, and is inconsistent with any tariff rate upon articles made or produced in Canada. This phase has therefore been discussed under (a). It is sufficient to remark here that the adoption of this plan prohibits any customs duty on any articles except tea, coffee, tobacco and spirits, and throws us back on to direct taxation for the greater part of our revenue.

Is Canada ready to abolish all protection, to tax only tea, coffee, tobacco and spirits, and levy direct taxation yearly for 26

■ 18 millions of dollars? If so, her electors can vote for Mr. Laurier and his party; if not, they must vote against him and his party.

The last of the four planks in the Grit tariff policy is

(c) Unrestricted Reciprocity with the United States.

Read Mr. Laurier's utterances given above and Sir Richard Cartwright's. You see clearly that the leaders have not given up their old love.

Speaking at Valleyfield, Que., in April, 1896, Mr. Laurier came out plainly for Unrestricted Reciprocity, discrimination and all. He said—"We will get a treaty with the United States if we can; and if England objects we will consider her objection. Let Lord Salisbury take care of the interests of England, and we will take care of the interests of Canada."

"The Conservatives say it would not be loyal to England. I am a Canadian, like yourselves, and I say that I am a loyal subject of Her Majesty; but if I love England, there is a country that I love still more, and that country is Canada."

Now, Unrestricted Reciprocity can not be got except Canada gives to United States trade which she denies to the rest of the world, Great Britain included. She must pay the price of discrimination against the mother country. But if the Grit policy

is one of the elimination "of every vestige of protection," how can they give United States products an advantage over these of all other countries, except they place a protective tariff against these latter countries? It is impossible. Again, if the Grit policy is to have Free Trade as it is in England, what have they to offer to the United States in return for their allowing our goods free entry into their market?

Unrestricted Reciprocity is utterly inconsistent with the other three planks of their platform. Either they are insincere and simply hoodwinking the electorate, or they are absurdly ignorant and incapable. Whichever it is, they are not worthy of confidence.

Can anyone combine in one practical policy, a plan which will unite

1. An utter absence of protection,

2. A Revenue Tariff on articles produced in Canada,

3. Free Trade as it is in England, and

4. Unrestricted Reciprocity with the United States, accompanied as it must be with

Discrimination, i. e., a protective tariff against the rest of the world.

Yet that is the impossible thing, dubbed a trade policy which you are asked to substitute for a well tried, and four times approved National Policy!

Will you do it?

Let your vote answer.

THE LIBERAL LEADER: A Criticism.

Without wishing in the least to detract from the personal character of Mr. Laurier, the individual, it becomes necessary to examine into the extravagant claims for Mr. Laurier, the Leader, at present, of the Liberal Party in Opposition; the Leader in prospect, so say his followers, of the Government of Canada.

(1) His Record as Administrator.

Early in the seventies, one or two well delivered speeches brought him into prominence with his party, and in 1876 he entered the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, as Minister of Inland Revenue. As a Minister he made no impression of strength upon the House, and as an Administrator he proved notably weak. No measure of its importance stands to the credit of his short ministerial term. Up to and in 1876 he declared himself a protectionist; in 1878 he followed his party against protection. Since then he has boxed his compass on Trade Policies.

(2) As to His Patriotism.

When the Riel rebellion arose, he openly

espoused the cause of the rebel; he declared that if he had been on the banks of the Saskatchewan he would have levelled his musket at the breast of the Canadian Volunteers who braved danger and death to preserve the integrity of Canada; he raised the cry of race and creed on the question of Riel's punishment, and, after Riel's death on the scaffold, openly led a national crusade to avenge the death of the rebel and murderer.

In 1887 and on, he took the part of the United States against his own country and Great Britain in the matter of the Atlantic Fisheries Treaty. While the Government of Canada sought with courtesy and firmness to protect the rights of our fishermen, and conducted their negotiations and carried out their measures of protection in a manner which secured the openly expressed approbation of the British Government and resulted in the Treaty of 1888 signed by President Cleveland, ratified by Canada and Great Britain, but refused by the Senate of the United States, Mr. Laurier found nothing better to do than to criticise every step

taken, oppose the ratification of the Treaty, and make speeches throughout the country in which he upheld the course of the United States, and accused the Government of Canada with barbaric and ungenerous treatment of that country. So flagrant was his conduct in this respect, that even the *Toronto Globe* was obliged to read him a severe lecture.

In 1890 and 1891 he made ostentatious tours to the United States, and in addressing audiences in Boston, denounced the course of Great Britain and Canada towards the United States, openly advocated the Commercial Union of Canada and the United States to the exclusion of British products, openly hinted at the ultimate separation of Canada from Great Britain, and created the general impression in the United States that the Liberal leader was at heart in favor of Political Union with that country. Here are some extracts from his speech in Boston, which amply prove these statements :—

"In my opinion the conduct of England, of Canada, towards the United States during the war, was a disgrace to the civilization of England, of Canada. The American people could fight their own battles; they required no help, but when they were engaged in a supreme struggle for the life or death of this great nation, when they were fighting for a cause as great, as holy as ever engaged the devotion of men; when they had reason to expect the outspoken sympathy of those nearest to them, it was galling that Southern privateers could be built, manned and equipped in England, with the passive connivance of the British Government, to destroy American commerce on the high seas; it was galling that rebel refugees could find shelter in Canada, and there with impunity and without provoking condemnation, plot abominable crimes to help secession." (Applause.)

"Canada is still a colony; it is still the destiny of colonies to become independent nations.

"The tie which now binds Canada to the mother land is Canada's own will, and it is with pride that I say it, though still a colony, yet Canada is free. (Applause.) Of course, light as is the dependence, it cannot last forever. Even at this day Canada and England have interests totally apart, and the time will come when, in the very nature of things, separation will take place."

"Our object is, when there is a Liberal Administration at Ottawa to offer to the United States the free entrance of our terri-

tory to all American products, whether natural or manufactured, provided the United States extend the same privileges to the products of Canada.

"This involves that we would offer to the the American nation advantages denied to the rest of the world.

"This is not a question of sentiment, and for my part, I am firmly convinced that the economic interests of Canada lie with this continent, and it is on the broad basis of continental freedom of trade that I place the question." (Applause.)

"The great, the fatal, the mistake of that idea (Imperial Federation) is the attempt to make allegiance, British allegiance, a basis of trade. Trade knows but one law—profit—and will move for and seek profit within or beyond allegiance, without any regard to it."

The above extracts speak for themselves. Uttered before a Boston audience, reported and read everywhere through the United States, and eagerly seized upon as the sentiments of the Liberal party in Canada, is it any wonder that they created an almost universal opinion in that country that Canada was ripe for separation from Great Britain, and ready for Commercial and Political Union with the United States?

What more unpatriotic and unjust than his attack upon the good faith of England and Canada in regard to the Civil War of 1864, when Canada's action was so friendly to the United States that her Government was officially thanked therefor! What more out of place for a loyal Canadian and British subject than to openly flaunt separation and implied annexation before the people of the United States!

(3) As to his Quebec Associations.

At and after the Riel agitation Mr. Laurier became the bosom friend and co-worker of Mr. Mercier in Quebec, to whose malign influence he seems to have completely succumbed, and with whom to the day of his death he held the closest political alliance. Among his many encomiums of Mr. Mercier, the following two are samples :—

"For 20 years I have known Mr. Mercier, and my admiration for him is as great to-day as it has been ever since I first knew him."

"I state frankly and without any reserve that Mr. Mercier is the greatest Canadian we have had since the days of Papineau."

To his close political alliance with Mr. Mercier, the following utterances of Mr. Laurier's attest :—

"On that question (increased subsidy to Quebec), I think I agree with Mr. Mercier

on whatever course he takes.'

"Mr. Mercier is the chief of the Nationalist party. I came here to work with you that the cause of Mr. Mercier may triumph in the coming elections—it is what you all want."

In 1887 Mr. Mercier evolved a scheme by which he proposed to make a raid upon the Dominion Treasury for an increased debt allowance, and increased yearly subsidy for Quebec. He induced Mr. Laurier to join him in this scheme. A direct bargain was later made between them by which Mr. Laurier was to help elect Mercier to power in 1890; that then Mr. Mercier was to give him a majority of 15 in Quebec in the Dominion Elections in 1891, and as payment therefor Mr. Laurier was, when he became Premier at Ottawa, to give to Quebec a yearly subsidy of \$400,000, besides other valuable assistance. Never in the history of Canadian politics was a more open and shameless bribe made use of.

Mr. Laurier went into the contest and helped seat Mr. Mercier in power in Quebec. The Dominion Elections came on, but before Mr. Mercier would speak in Montreal he demanded by telegram that Laurier should promise to give him the subsidy if he were to be in power at Ottawa. Mr. Laurier gave his promise by telegram, and then Mr. Mercier threw himself into the contest.

He said:—

"Mr. Laurier wishes it, and I am here at his side, fighting for the triumph of the cause which is so dear to us all."

"I and my colleagues have placed ourselves entirely at Mr. Laurier's disposal, and he can rely upon us in the interesting and hopeful struggle in which he is about to engage."

"Hon. Mr. Laurier has accepted the resolutions of the inter-provincial conference of 1887, and promised to give effect to them if he comes into power. It is our duty to make him triumph."

Again he said—

"I have no doubt that if Hon. Mr. Laurier becomes first Minister in the Dominion, the Province will get whatever it asks."

On Feb. 11th, 1891, Pacaud wrote in *L'Electeur*:

"Mr. Mercier has bound himself by a solemn engagement to put Mr. Laurier in power."

And after the Election Mr. Mercier said:

"I have kept my promise to Mr. Laurier, and I have no doubt that if Mr. Laurier becomes First Minister of the Dominion the Province will get whatever it asks."

Quebec was carried for Mercier in 1890 and for Mr. Laurier in 1891, and we are asked to believe that through all this Mr. Laurier bore himself as pure and untainted.

We are asked to believe that for all these years, whilst the air in Quebec reeked with public corruption—while the Langelins, the Pacauds and the Tartes were exploiting the public funds—the shrewd, far-seeing, wide-awake, immaculate Leader of the Liberal Party ate and slept with these men, his party partook of the spoils, and he, good, innocent soul, never scented the corruption! That whilst every man on the streets of Quebec and Montreal knew what was going on, Mr. Laurier was sublimely ignorant—immaculately pure!

Who can believe this? If he was so innocent and unsuspecting, and knew so little of what was transpiring, he is not fit for a leader.

If he did know and condoned it, and allowed his party to profit by it, he is not the immaculate leader his followers would fain have us believe.

Finally, it all came out; how the treasury had been literally looted, how a perfect carnival of corruption had held sway, and how that at the last, Mercier was dismissed by Governor Angers, and the people were appealed to. Where was Mr. Laurier in this contest?

The Toronto *Globe* declared Mercier and his partners to be a set of thieves.

The London Advertiser said:

"They have not only tolerated and encouraged extravagance, but have profited by the corrupt transactions that have grown out of their policy. The resources of the country have been squandered for the benefit of political favorites, who, in turn, have handed over hundreds of thousands of dollars of the ill-gotten gains to members of the Government to be distributed in keeping these men in power by illegal means."

The Woodstock *Sentinel Review* said:

"The duty of the Liberals both in Quebec and throughout the Dominion is clear; they should repudiate and denounce him as they would any other boodler. The Langlais transaction is simply theft, for which all implicated should be proceeded against in the courts."

The Montreal *Witness* and Huntingdon *Gleaner*, both Liberal papers, denounced and repudiated Mercier and all his works. Where was Mr. Laurier?

He took the stump for his dear friend and political ally. He addressed a meeting in his favor at St. Sauveur, he wrote regrets at being unable to be present at the

Mercier meeting at St Rochs, and called loudly on his followers to elect Mr. Mercier again to power.

So shameless was this open support of the worst political corruption ever known in modern political history that so staunch a Liberal paper as the *Huntingdon Gleaner* was moved to declare.

"The doubt is whether it is not requisite that Mr. Laurier should be similarly dealt with. His intimacy with Mercier, his association with him in his plans to bring about the Provincial autonomy and obtain an increase in the Dominion subsidy, closely identify him with the boodler chieftain, so that it is difficult to see how the Liberal party can clear itself of all responsibility for Mercierism without deposing Laurier as its leader. His advice at St. Sauveur last week convicts him as one implicated with the Nationalists. Condemning in sweeping terms those political crimes which have come to be known as boodlerism, he yet urged his hearers to re-elect the Quebec boodlers. What he denounces hand."

The investigation into Mr. Mercier's corrupt administration directly implicated Mr. Laurier and his party.

Pacaud was Mr. Laurier's organizer in Quebec. He was allowed by Mercier to steal \$100,000 out of the Bay de Chaleur subsidies, and he used these moneys, or a part of them, to pay election expenses, and, as Tarte says, "to assist my friend Laurier to carry a majority of seats in Quebec."

Mr. Laurier has never asked his party to recoup these stolen moneys, nor has he to this hour recorded any denunciation of the flagrant and horrible corruption in which Mercier and his friends were found guilty.

Does his connection with Mr. Mercier and his corruption point to him as a safe and pure leader?

(4) Mr. Laurier and His Present Associates.

To-day, who are Mr. Laurier's political associates and confidants in Quebec? His organizer is J. Israel Tarte, his chief counsellor is Mr. Langelier, his intimate editorial apologist and defendant is the notorious Pacaud, his pet representative is the fragrant Hon. "Jimmy" McShane, and his entourage is the "old gang" which thrived and fattened on the Mercier corruption, and which, *La Patrie* says, "with ladles ready," now "smell the soup" at Ottawa, and are eager and hungry for the feed they expect when their leaders "take the reins."

In 1886, Messrs. Fielding and Longley headed a crusade to take Nova Scotia and, if possible, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island also, out of the union.

The watchwords were given by Mr. Fielding, who said:

"The interest of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are alike in this matter. All these Provinces have been sacrificed in the Confederation. The people are in earnest in this matter and the politician who fails to keep faith with them will have reason to regret that he has come forward to take part in the agitation."

By Mr. Longley, who said:

"I stand here a repealer. It is warring against every element of geography to attempt to establish any consolidated nationality under our present Union."

"No Canadian party can have our sympathy." "The repeal movement is a revolt against the Dominion of Canada. The most honest and just Government at Ottawa could not reconcile this Province to Confederation. Repeal has sprung from the British North America Act."

And by the party press, which declared:

"By the election of June, 1886, the Liberal party of Nova Scotia has cut itself adrift from the Canadian party of the same name, and pledged itself first and foremost to seek separation from Canada. It is high time that certain Liberals as well as Tories understood this. The cry is Nova Scotians versus Canadians."

If successful, they would have absolutely broken up Confederation, and the sure result would have been the absorption of the various provinces into the United States. Mr. Davies, Mr. Laurier's Maritime province lieutenant, persistently laments Confederation. He declared lately at Ottawa:—

"And not any Province of the three has reached forward to a measurable distance of that prosperity which was predicted and hoped for when we unfortunately joined this Confederation."

Then, and to this day Mr. Laurier has been the bosom friend of these gentlemen, has found no voice to rebuke the open attempt made to dismember Canada, and was and is their apologist and political ally.

If he gains power these men will help to form his Ministry and govern Canada. They have never abjured the sentiments expressed by them.

Are these facts or not? Search and see. If they are, do they form reasons for making the Liberal leader the ruler of the destinies of Canada?

(5) Mr. Laurier and His Public Policies and Principles.

The one thing above all else that Canada demands in a leader is conviction on lines

of large public policy—well based and firmly adhered to.

HAS MR. LAURIER ANY?

He used to wax eloquent on the principle of non-interference as between Provincial and Federal politics. The Local Government should not interfere in Dominion contests, the Dominion Government should not interfere in local contests—the parties should be kept absolutely apart.

HOW NOW?

He himself made a compact with Mercier by which he and his followers took the stump for Mercier, and in return Mercier and his whole force took the stump for Mr. Laurier and against the Dominion Government. He himself calls upon Greenway of Manitoba, Mowat of Ontario, Blair of New Brunswick, Fielding of Nova Scotia and Peters of P. E. Island to address his meetings, and to set all the machinery of their local patronage at work to secure the defeat of the Federal Government and the success of his own party.

In Quebec, however, he said, as late as 1892:

"Nor did he speak as the leader of the Liberal party in Canada, but only as a private citizen, it being his policy oftentimes expressed to separate Federal from Provincial matters."

His tongue utters one thing, his hands do quite the different thing. What has become of his principles in this respect? Had he any? Has he any?

More than in any other respect a country demands a settled line of policy in trade and fiscal matters. Trade and industries group themselves about the policy of a country, and vast interests grow up dependent upon its continuity. Change unsettles all; frequent change utterly demoralizes the foundations and operations of commerce.

In trade policy convictions are necessary—well based convictions—convictions firmly adhered to.

Mr. Laurier's Shifts.

What about Mr. Laurier's trade policies?

1. *He has been an avowed protectionist.*

In 1876 he said in the House of Commons:

"What my Honorable friend has said as to my protection proclivities, is perfectly true. I do not deny that I have been a protectionist, which I am still. It is asserted by many and assumed by others, that Free Trade is a Liberal principle, and protection a Conservative principle. I beg to dissent from this doctrine. If I were in Great Britain, I would avow Free

Trade, but I am a Canadian, and I think we require protection."

2. *He has been an out and out Commercial Unionist.*

In Toronto, in September, 1889, he said:

"The policy which we advocate, which we still continue to advocate, is the removal of all commercial barriers between this country and the great kindred nation to the south. The Liberal party, as long as I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause until the cause is successful. I do not expect to win in a day, but I am prepared to remain in the cool shades of opposition until this cause triumphed."

3. *He has been a Continental Free Trader.*

Here is his declaration:—

"The Liberal party will never cease the agitation until they have finally triumphed and obtained continental freedom of trade."

"We will not be drawn away by this issue or that issue, and keeping our eyes on the goal, will work till we accomplish our end."

"If the Reformers of these days can accomplish what they have in view—the great principle of free trade in America—they will have done to their country and to the British race a service of which they will have reason to be proud."

4. *He has been an out and out disciple of Unrestricted Reciprocity.*

In 1891 he said: "When the Liberal party comes into power it will send commissioners to Washington to propose mutual agreement, by which there will be Free Trade along the whole line, doing away with restrictions and removing the Customs Houses that go so far to cause friction between the two countries."

5. *He has been an equally ardent disciple of Restricted Reciprocity.*

In 1894 he said: "If we come to power, on that day, I promise you, a commission will go to Washington, and if we can get a Treaty in natural products and a list of manufactured articles that Treaty will be made."

"The policy of the Liberal party is to give you a market with sixty-five millions of British men upon this continent."

6. *He is now out for Free Trade as it exists in Great Britain.*

In 1895 he said in Montreal: "The Liberal party believe in Free Trade on broad lines, such as exists in Great Britain; and upon that platform, exemplified as I have told you, the Liberal party will fight its next battle."

Here is wonderful versatility! For many years a Protectionist, he at last cuts loose the safe moorings, and behold, in less than

six years, as leader of a great party, posing as a statesman, and asking business Canada to entrust its immense commercial interests to his charge, he has propounded six utterly inconsistent and different basic principles of tariff and trade legislation.

Can anything be more ridiculous? What do business men think of it? As a gyrating tariff weathercock, excellent! But as a political economist and statesman in a business country, absurd!

The truth is that Mr. Laurier knows nothing of business and economic trade principles. He strains after catch cries, tries one, finds it does not work, tries another and so on and so forth.

Surely our bankers, our shippers, our traders, our manufacturers, or agriculturalists and artisans want a man of convictions, not of fanciful theories.

Mr. Laurier and the Manitoba Schools.

1. He attacked the Government for delay.

The minority he declared was suffering an injustice—an outrageous injustice. The Government should act at once; the Act of 1890 should be disallowed. Delay was insufferable; the Government was censurable therefor.

2. He attacked the Government for insincerity.

Why go to the courts, he asked. It was merely a pretext for doing nothing. The question is one of fact, not of law. The Government is cowardly, it dares not act, it shelters itself behind the tribunals; meanwhile injustice remains and Confederation is imperiled.

3. In the session of 1895 he attacked the Government for not bringing in a bill.

You have the decisions of the courts, he said; your powers are known the grievance is affirmed, where is your bill? You dare not bring it, you are still insincere, and, what is more, cowardly.

4. In the autumn of 1895 he demanded a commission of enquiry.

We don't know the facts, he declared.

We are ignorant. Full five years have shed its light on the question, still our knowledge is inadequate. Give a commission, and let them inquire into the facts. True, I have always been against delay; true, the commission will cause more delay; no matter, I will eat my words, but now I plant myself squarely on the platform of further delay and a commission.

(5) In the beginning of the session of 1896 he wants the bill. Where is the bill? he demands. We don't want estimates, we don't want general business, we want the bill. Is the government still cowardly and insincere? If not, let us have the bill.

(6.) And now he wants neither the bill nor a commission.

The bill came down. Mr. Laurier rose to speak upon it, and behold! This man who for years had the denounced government for delay, for cowardice, for insincerity, who had demanded justice, a commission, and the bill suddenly turned round—repudiated his commission of enquiry business, and proposed to kill the bill by moving the six months' hoist. Could anyone more completely swallow himself?

But a large number of his followers refused to follow him. He had led them to demand justice to the minority and a bill. When he was ready to turn, they were committed to remedial legislation. Within two weeks the house and country witnessed the unique spectacle of—

(a) Mr. McCarthy leading a little band of obstructionists and the Protestant section of the Liberal party in a crusade against remedial legislation.

(b) The Catholic section of the Liberal party broken loose from their party and their former leader, and refusing to follow Mr. McCarthy.

For the Liberal leader—limp and nerveless—wandering disconsolately among the toppling ruin of his hopes—a leader without a following, trotting along at the heels of Mr. McCarthy and his obstructionists.

What a leader! What a tactician!







